22nd October 1927]

(*b*) whether the Agent, South Indian Railway Company, has considered the above proposal and thinks it feasible; and

(*c*) if so, what action will be taken in the matter?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The Agent has reported that the proposal is not feasible.

(*c*) The Government have decided to drop the matter.

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" May I ask why the Government have chosen to drop this matter and also whether the railway companies objected to it because it would affect their traffic?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" No, Sir. The objection to it was that any additional weight to this bridge would endanger its structure."

Additional nominations to the District Board of Kistna.

*855 *Q.*—The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) why the Government nominated 18 more members to the District Board of Kistna by notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 13th September 1927, five months after the reconstitution of the Board;

(*b*) whether all of them were elected members of the previous District Board; if not, how many;

(*c*) whether the President, District Board, Kistna, was consulted about these nominations;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that M.R.Ry. Kandimalla Sitarama Rao Bahadur Garu and M.R.Ry. Gummadapu Venkataranga Rao Garu were the ex-officio members of the old Kistna District Board and that they were nominated as members of their respective taluk boards to facilitate their becoming ex-officio members of the reconstituted District Board;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that the abovesaid two gentlemen have tried for the presidentship of the respective taluk boards and failed, and thus they have lost their ex-officio membership;

(*f*) whether the Government have considered the question of nominating the elected members of the old District Board to the reconstituted District Board when they first constituted it; if so, why the Government have taken up the question again; and

(*g*) whether there is any precedent for this policy of adding nominations to the local boards from time to time?

A.—(*a*) The Government considered the appointments desirable.

(*b*) Fourteen of the new members were elected members of the old Kistna District Board.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) The gentlemen referred to were ex-officio members of the old Kistna District Board. They were appointed to their respective taluk boards, but not for the reasons suggested.

(*e*) The Government have no information.

(*f*) Yes. The reason is as stated in clause (*a*) supra.

(*g*) No. There has been no previous case of reconstitution of district boards under section 240 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920.